

I

Reg

Editor of

SIR,—

has add

asking a

tions pr

are infor

Liberal"

England

ostensibl

tion of

made

fore

engaged

to inflict

dian rail

United

mark wa

nut like

would, v

into the

I purp

ing, thro

to me.

1st qu

Dominio

advocate

No; no

United S

for Dom

of annex

as a cand

of Annex

stay at h

one of th

the Dom

poses.

INFORMATION GIVEN

Regarding Annexation and other matters.

Editor of THE CITIZEN.

SIR,—A publishing firm in New York has addressed circulars to persons in Canada asking answers from them to certain questions propounded. These answers are, we are informed, to be "grouped by an English Liberal" and published simultaneously in England and the United States." The ostensible cause, prompting to the distribution of these circulars, is a remark made by Mr. Chauncey Depew before the Callom Committee now engaged in trying to discover how to inflict the maximum of injury on Canadian railways at the minimum of injury to United States railways. Mr. Depew's remark was a repetition of that mossy chestnut likening Canada to a plum, which would, when ripe, drop of its own accord into the United States hat.

I purpose, with your permission, answering, through your columns, the circular sent to me.

1st question: "Is the annexation of the Dominion to the United States seriously advocated?"

No; not in Canada. We have, unlike the United States, an absolutely secret ballot for Dominion elections. Let any advocate of annexation proclaim himself such and offer as a candidate. He will get all the votes of Annexationists. But he will be elected to stay at home by a large majority in every one of the 205 electoral districts into which the Dominion is divided for Federal purposes.

There is no "Separatist party" in Canada in the sense of an Annexation party. The people of Canada would probably regard an avowed Annexationist with good-natured contempt as a mild lunatic, an irresponsible crank or a concealed sorehead.

2nd question: "If there is no Annexation party, why has the question received so much attention in the press and on the platform?"

The question has not received any great attention or been given any prominence by press and platform in Canada. There has been a question of Commercial Union brought before the Canadian people, and instead of troubling themselves to answer the arguments of Commercial Unionists on their merits (or demerits), the press and the platform have met those arguments by the easy response: "We will have nothing to do with Commercial Union; it would lead to Annexation." Both political parties repudiate any belief in or sympathy with Commercial Union. It sometimes happens that a candidate is charged with being an Annexationist. If there is a grain of truth in the charge; if some time or other in his callow youth he said something that could be twisted into an indication that he "looked to Washington," that candidate is put "in the soup" without ceremony.

Question 3rd: "Is there any feeling of discontent with Canadian political institutions other than those expressed for party purposes by the Parliamentary Opposition?"

I do not observe any signs of discontent with the constitution. The Opposition, like the early States rights men in

the United States, are advocates of a strict interpretation of the constitution. The guardians of Federal rights do their duty and prevent any encroachment on the Federal authority. Thus there have been disputes. But these have been settled either by reference to the Courts of Canada or by appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of England, whose decision have always been accepted as final. We have thus settled a great many questions similar to those which in the United States were left unsettled, causing, in the early years of the political history of the United States, great discontent, finally culminating in a terrible civil war. The Canadian constitution—the Union Act of 1867, is a much more skillfully drawn up document than the United States articles of Confederation. It gives the people much more direct power over the Government, which, consequently, is more responsive to the popular will than the Executive of the United States.

The constitution of the Dominion has been in existence twenty-one years. In that time it may be that half a dozen amendments have been proposed. None has been very seriously agitated for.

In the United States during their first score of years there must have been three or four hundred amendments to the constitution proposed and debated seriously in Congress. There were 77 amendments to the constitution proposed before Washington was inaugurated first President. There was open rebellion in Western Pennsylvania in a year after that event took place. Nor have later years brought any stay in the suggestions of amendments. During the 19 years since 1870 three hundred and ten amendments to the United States Constitution have been offered.

While the United States constitution has been tossed about like a canoe on stormy waters, the Canadian constitution firmly anchored to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of England, has passed its youth in serenity and enters its manhood with every sign of patriotic acceptance by the Canadian people.

4th question: "Is there any impatience with the political relations existing between the Dominion and the parent country?"

There has been a certain degree of restiveness among some politicians (the "outs" invariably) because Canada does not make

her own treaties. It never struck its roots into the popular heart. It was a theoretical rather than a practical grievance, and now that the parent country has remodelled its plan perfect satisfaction is the prevailing feeling. The parent country either gives permission to Canada's diplomatic representative to negotiate treaties in Canadian interests or having made treaties by her own diplomatists only includes Canada in them when Canada expresses a wish to be included.

There is also a large and growing body of Canadians who are "impatient" with the political relations between the parent country and Canada because they believe those relations not as close and intimate as they ought to be. These persons advocate the admission of Canadians to full citizenship in the Empire. I have attended several of their meetings, and I must say their views are received with all tokens of enthusiastic acceptance, far different from the comparative silence with which the advocates of closer relations with the United States are received by the general public, though the latter appeal to the cupidity of their hearers, telling them how much more money they would have in their pockets, and the former appeal to the sentiment of loyalty and admit that it will cost something to secure full citizenship, with its responsibilities.

The question of independence has been pretty well threshed out, with the result that much more chaff than wheat has been found. Annexation has never during the life of the Confederation risen to the dignity of a question. It was threshed to death years and years ago. It is like a long-drowned man—all the rolling over barrels, all the hot flannels, all the imitations of respiration possible, cannot cause revivification. It's as dead as Julius Caesar.

Question 5th: "What are your views upon the system of Government under Confederation as compared with that of the United States?"

It is affirmed by some that humanity has been evolved from some hideous animal existence bearing but slight resemblance to the present highly developed organization called the human race.

In the same way the Canadian constitution, evolved from previous federative constitutions, is immeasurably superior in every respect to all its predecessors. The election

of your Chief Magistrate is as often as not consummated by the minority, and always by means of bribery on a large scale. As far back as 1824 the man of the people was "beaten" out of the Presidency. Tilden's case is fresh in the memory. Cleveland had a majority of the votes of the people. Your plan of creating Senators has turned the United States Senate into a body of rich men who have bought their places from the State Legislatures. There are said to be but four poor men in the United States Senate. All the rest represent the Plutocracy. Your plan of electing Judges stimulates bribery and dwarfs judicial independence. In fact, from top to bottom the system of government in the United States is a corrupting engine, destroying all high ideal of honest government.

A leading advocate of Commercial Union from New York, speaking at Ottawa, received the heartiest demonstrations of applause when he said, "Canada is infinitely better governed than the United States," and the applause was deafening when he added, "You Canadians should go down on your knees every night of your lives and thank God for the superior Constitution under which you live." I did my level best to assist in these demonstrations.

Question 6th: "In your opinion, what is the political destiny of Canada?"

The question is a large one. While still a people in the gristle, we have shown that there is good stuff in us. The United States did not secure all-rail connection between the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans till they had a population of 37 millions, and then only after years and years spent in building the railway. Canada built her C. P. R. when she had a population of less than five millions, and did it in 4½ years. The canal system of Canada is on a grand scale. Our whole system of transportation is planned on east and west lines. The population of Canada has increased in a greater ratio than that of the United States. There is a strong and growing Canadian sentiment. Assured by the Mother Country that we are free to mould our future to our own liking, we Canadians have a warm love for the generous mother land. I have studied England and Canada closely, and I am convinced that Canadian loyalty to the Queen is a deeper sentiment than English loyalty. Bullied by the United States in a curiously characteristic style, we

have cultivated a feeling of indifference towards our neighbours. We like them well enough. But we have discovered that it does not pay to put ourselves in their power in any way. These and many more factors must be weighed and given their proper place as influential forces, the play of which will decide the future of Canada. I think that the political destiny of Canada is to remain as she is till we are ten or twenty millions of people, when possibly there may come into the sphere of practical politics the question of closer relations with the rest of the Empire. Everything tends at present in that direction. The greatest destiny a country can have is that before Canada, viz., to be the great world-path by which the Asiatic and Australian portions of the Empire shall come to as complete unification of the Empire as is compatible with full liberty of action for the several parts.

CANADIAN.

Since the above was written an election was held in one of the counties of the Eastern Townships whose southern line is the international boundary between Canada and the United States, with the result announced in the following telegram:

Sherbrooke, 17th.—All the returns from Compton have been received. Mr. Pope's majority is 839. The successful candidate has received congratulatory telegrams from all parts of the Dominion. His election by so large a majority is a significant repudiation of the policy of Free Trade with the United States, while maintaining Customs duties against the products of the Mother Country and the rest of the world. Some had so much confidence in the popularity of that obnoxious party, that they calculated upon the success of their candidate, Mr. Munro. They are sorely disappointed over the result, and Conservatives are proportionately jubilant over Mr. Pope's great victory.

We draw attention to the answers of "Canadian" to a series of questions asked by a New York firm, with the object of publication, in regard to Annexation and other matters. "Canadian's" answers embody the sentiments of the great mass of the people of the Dominion.—*Ottawa Citizen*.

NORTH-WEST SETTLEMENT.

The United States and Canada Compared.

Editor of THE CITIZEN :

SIR,—In consequence of an interview published in your journal, several correspondents have written me asking two questions: 1st, Why Canada's North-West has not increased in population as rapidly as the United States' domain; 2nd, Why the farmers of the United States, as a body, are in less prosperous circumstances than the farmers of Ontario.

I did not bargain for so much additional work when the interview was published. But the questions are important ones, and it would ill become me to shirk them, in the circumstances. Will you, therefore, kindly give me space in your next issue to discuss the first question?

First, I ask is it so? Now, how shall we go to work to find out? Well, the proper way, it seems to me, is to examine the records. These show that the United States formed a Union in 1787; that by 1789 thirteen States had ratified the Constitution and secured a President. These thirteen States had their metes and bounds. Some of them cast off portions of their territory to form new States—as Massachusetts out of which Maine was carved, and Virginia out of which West Virginia and Tennessee were formed. Other outlying regions were purchased, or otherwise obtained, as California, Louisiana and Texas. The remainder formed the unorganized territory, to which settlement was to be directed, just as our Manitoba and North-West Territories have constituted, since July, 1870, the region in which we Canadians have had to try our hand at colonizing.

To find out which country settled its outlying territory the more rapidly, we may take the first twenty-three years of the United States' possession of their outlying domain and compare the development of that domain with the development which has taken place in our North-West during

Canada's nineteen years' possession of her outlying territory. This is hardly fair to Canada because it gives the United States four years longer for their efforts than it gives Canada. But we have the record, supplied by their own hand, of the population in 1810. We will give the United States the advantage of four years longer record than we can give Canada, and we will say nothing about it.

At the end of the first twenty-three years (from 1787 to 1810) Alabama, Arkansas, Indiana, Michigan, Florida, Missouri, Arizona, Dakota, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, Iowa, Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, Oregon, Wisconsin and Colorado (which States and Territories comprise the unoccupied domain of the original States at the time of their union) had a population of 62,409 all told. The four million people in the original States had managed in twenty-three years to plant colonies throughout their outlying domain, aggregating a population of 62,409 souls.

Now, what has Canada done in the nineteen years of her possession of the North-West? Taking the population in 1871, we had within our borders 3,600,000 souls—four hundred thousand fewer than the United States, when they began colonizing operations in their outlying public domain. The 3,600,000 persons have secured for Manitoba and the North-West in nineteen years a white population of 180,000 souls. In a word, we have managed our colonization plans so well that we have in nineteen years beaten the United States record of twenty-three years, three to one. Where they planted one settler we have planted three.

In the face of these facts, I cannot agree with those correspondents who, by asking why Canada has not increased her North-West population as rapidly as the United States' outlying regions increased, imply that she has not. We have been very much more successful than our neighbors, and there are the records to show it.

Yours,

GEORGE JOHNSON.

her
r to
ates
n it
the
own
810.
ad-
a we
hing

years
ansas,
ouri,
New
ning,
aska,
orado
ne the
tes at
ion of
people
ed in
ough-
ing a

nine-
North-
1871,
souls—
n the
onizing
omain.
ed for
ineteen
souls.
d our
ve have
States
to one.
ve have

t agree
asking
North-
United
ply that
y much
ors, and

INSON.